

no longer automatically eligible for work authorization. As a result of the reforms, our asylum system now works to ensure that legitimate asylum seekers are protected and those who file fraudulent claims are weeded out.

We have a tradition in this country of protecting bona fide refugees. We have an asylum system that is working well to continue this tradition. The provisions included in the underlying bill would have undermined our good efforts to the detriment of the very people we are seeking to protect. The Leahy amendment appropriately gives the Attorney General the flexibility to address emergency migration situations but retains our current asylum procedures for those who arrive in the United States and request political asylum. I am happy to say that my colleagues in the Senate recognized the importance of retaining this flexibility and voted to include this amendment in the final bill.

While I support the general principles underlying this bill, I believe we must also find new ways to address the problems of illegal immigration. I am among the first to admit that we cannot afford to absorb an unregulated flow of immigrants into our country. However, I am concerned by the short-sighted approach that is taken to address this problem. Sometimes we find ourselves so caught up in the crises of the day that we forget to look at the root causes of problems. In the case of illegal immigration, I think we have fallen into this trap.

We can continue to increase our Border Patrol and our enforcement activities in the United States. We can build a wall that stretches along the United States-Mexico border and the United States-Canadian border. While this may make it more difficult for illegal immigrants to enter the United States, I do not believe that these measures will solve the problem of illegal immigration. Similarly, we can tighten employer sanctions and cut off all public benefits for illegal aliens, in an attempt to take away the "magnets" which create the desire for people to enter our country with or without proper documentation.

I believe we must look beyond these so-called magnets to focus on creating opportunities for people within their own countries so they aren't compelled to leave in search of better opportunities to support their families. To do this, the United States must maintain its leadership in promoting human rights, democracy, and economic stability in our neighboring countries, and around the world. Unfortunately, I fear that we have recently begun to retreat from this position. In the past few years, the United States has curtailed its spending on foreign aid and humanitarian assistance programs. This year, we essentially demolished our international family planning program, which will severely affect maternal and child health around the world. Further, we continue to funnel arms into the

poorest and most politically unstable countries across the globe.

We cannot continue along this path. It is only when we address the root causes of illegal immigration—poverty, warfare, and persecution—that the United States can truly address and eliminate this problem.

One final note, Mr. President. In this bill, we have significantly enhanced the ability of the Immigration and Naturalization Service [INS] to meet one of its primary missions, to control the entry of illegal immigrants into this country. But, I would like to take this opportunity to remind my colleagues that the enforcement mission is not the only mission of the INS. The INS also exists to serve, to meet the needs of citizens, legal residents, and visitors. It has the responsibility to provide service to millions of individuals and employers who are following the rules, and trying to bring family and employees into the United States legally.

Due to the recent national attention that has been given to illegal immigration, I fear that this part of the INS mission statement has been severely neglected. For example, many district and regional INS offices have unreliable phone service, have tremendous backlogs in paperwork, and fail to initiate community outreach. My State's district office in Portland, OR, no longer even distributes necessary forms to the public. I had planned to introduce an amendment to this bill which would have addressed this situation. It would have required all INS district and regional offices to distribute forms, and would have expressed the Senate's desire that the INS provide adequate resources to fulfill its service mission.

Unfortunately, I did not have an opportunity to bring this amendment to the floor for consideration on this bill. However, I believe this is an issue of utmost importance and will continue to pursue enhancing the INS's service mission through subsequent legislation or through communications with Commissioner Doris Meissner. Citizens, permanent residents, and visitors across the country need, and deserve, to have access to the services only the INS can provide for them.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RAISE THE MINIMUM WAGE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the American people are baffled by the continuing, relentless, Republican opposition to a fair increase in the minimum wage. A raise of 90 cents an hour for America's lowest paid and hardest-

pressed workers is so fundamentally fair and reasonable that it is hard to imagine why anyone would oppose it.

Our Republican friends are hoisted by their own hypocrisy. They preach the value of work, but they reject a living wage. The minimum wage has not been raised in 5 years. It is stuck at \$4.25 an hour, \$8,500 a year—not even enough to lift a family out of poverty.

There is even more hypocrisy than that. Republican Senators have voted for three pay raises themselves in that 5-year period—thousands of dollars for themselves, but not one dime for families struggling to survive on the minimum wage.

Senator DOLE has compiled, to put it mildly, an interesting voting record on the minimum wage during his career in Congress. His position appears to depend on the fads of politics, or perhaps the phases of the Moon. The only consistency is that there is no consistency.

Arriving in Congress as a freshman in the House of Representatives in 1961, he took an extreme antiminimum wage position against President Kennedy's proposal to raise the minimum wage. At the time, the minimum wage had not been increased since 1955. An increase was one of the first priorities of President Kennedy's New Frontier, and Congress responded quickly and favorably.

Tomorrow—Friday, May 3—is the 35th anniversary of BOB DOLE's vote against the bill, which President Kennedy signed into law on May 5, 1961, and which raised the minimum wage from \$1 to \$1.25 an hour.

In fact, the minimum wage had been one of the key issues in the Kennedy-Nixon 1960 Presidential campaign. As a Senator in 1960, President Kennedy had led a battle to raise the minimum wage, but Congress failed to act when House-Senate conferees deadlocked in a post-convention session in August 1960. President Kennedy then took the issue to the country, and in a TV ad that fall opposing Vice President Nixon's position, he stated:

Mr. Nixon has said that a \$1.25 minimum wage is extreme. That's \$50 a week. What's extreme about that? I believe the next Congress and the President should pass a minimum wage for a \$1.25 an hour. Americans must be paid enough to live.

BOB DOLE and Richard Nixon were wrong to oppose President Kennedy's minimum wage increase 35 years ago—and BOB DOLE and RICHARD ARMEY are wrong to oppose President Clinton's minimum wage increase today.

At least once a decade since then, however, Senator DOLE has voted the other way and supported an increase in the minimum wage. He did so in the 1970's, and again in the 1980's. And I urge him to do so now in the 1990's.

Seven years ago, Senator DOLE and many of the same Republicans who are now leading the opposition to a 90-cent increase in the minimum wage supported precisely that—a 90-cent increase.